

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figures 1(A) and 1(B), Figures 5(A) and 5(B), and Figures 6(A) and 6(B). The sheets replace the original sheets.

In Figure 1(A), a dotted line was added to indicate a cross-sectional cut for Figure 1(B). In Figure 1(B), hatched lines within sections were added.

In Figure 5(A), applicant has replaced a solid line indicating a cross-sectional cut for Figure 5(B) with a dotted line. In Figure 5(B) letters "A" and "A'" were deleted.

In Figure 6(A), hatched lines of sections were added.

Attachments: 3 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 10. Claims 1-15 are still pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure due to non-uniform use of terminologies throughout the specification. In response, applicant has amended the phrase "housing 21" to "housing hole 21", and the phrase "holder 4" to "roller holder 4".

The Examiner stated that the syntax of the sentence which commences on line 7 of paragraph 28 does not read correctly. In response, applicant has amended paragraph 28. The Examiner is also confused by the phrase "toward the outside of shaft 23". Applicant has deleted the phrase. The Examiner also suggested changing the word "breaks" to "brakes" in paragraph 46. Applicant has amended paragraph 46 according to the Examiner's suggestion.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that there is no basis in the specification for "squeezing member", "engagement mechanism", "regulating force generator" and "tube position regulating means". Applicant has amended the specification to provide the proper antecedent basis. Applicant submits that no new matter is added as the amendment is fully supported by the specification as filed.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to show the feature of "said resilient tube being provided with a tube position regulating means" of claim 6 and "a regulating force generator that provides a regulating force to the squeezing member" of claim 10. For claim 6, the phrase has been amended to make it clear that a tube position regulating means is not a part of the resilient tube. For claim 10, although applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, the phrase "squeezing member" has been amended to "squeezing member holder" solely to accommodate the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings because parts in section are not hatched and parts in elevation are not shaded in FIGs. 1(B), 6(A) and 6(B). The Examiner further objected to the drawings for not complying with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(i) which requires that the plane upon which a sectional view is taken should be indicated on the general view by a broken line, the ends of which should be

designated by numerals corresponding to the figure number of the sectional view and have arrows applied to indicate the direction in which the view is taken. Applicant herewith submits replacement sheets with corrections as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. For claim 6, the Examiner stated that the phrase "said resilient tube being provided with a tube position regulating means" is not described in the specification. Applicant has amended claim 6 to clarify that the tube position regulating means is separate from the resilient tube.


For claim 10, the Examiner stated that the phrase "a regulating force generator that provides a regulating force to the squeezing member" is not described in the specification. Although applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, claim 10 has been amended such that the regulating force generator provides a regulating force to the squeezing member holder.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. For claim 1, the Examiner stated that the phrase "whose surface" is unclear. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the surface refers to the cam member surface. For claim 1, the Examiner also stated that it is not clear in which manner the movements of the squeezing member holder and the cam member correspond. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the squeezing member holder and the cam member move together.

For claim 1, the Examiner stated that the phrases "as", "interval", and "width (horizontal)" are unclear. Applicant has amended those phrases. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 1-9 are all definite.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its earlier allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact him at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 40,243)
For Eugene LeDonne
Reg. No. 35,930

REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue - 29th
Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650
(212) 521-5402

Attorney for Applicant